

1 JAMES McMANIS (40958)  
 2 MARWA ELZANKALY (206658)  
 3 CHRISTINE PEEK (234573)  
 4 McMANIS FAULKNER  
 5 A Professional Corporation  
 6 50 W. San Fernando, 10th Floor  
 7 San Jose, CA 95113  
 8 Telephone: (408) 279-8700  
 9 Facsimile: (408) 279-3244  
 10 [melzankaly@mcmmanisfaulkner.com](mailto:melzankaly@mcmmanisfaulkner.com)  
 11 [cpeek@mcmmanisfaulkner.com](mailto:cpeek@mcmmanisfaulkner.com)

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Rahinah Ibrahim  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

RAHINAH IBRAHIM, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
 SECURITY; JANET NAPOLITANO, in her  
 official capacity as Secretary of the  
 Department of Homeland Security;  
 MICHAEL CHERTOFF, in his official  
 capacity as the former Secretary of the  
 Department of Homeland Security; TOM  
 RIDGE, in his official capacity as the former  
 Secretary of the Department of Homeland  
 Security; ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., in his  
 official capacity as Attorney General;  
 TERRORIST SCREENING CENTER;  
 LEONARD C. BOYLE, in his official  
 capacity as Director of the Terrorist  
 Screening Center; DONNA A. BUCELLA,  
 in her official capacity as former Director of  
 the Terrorist Screening Center; FEDERAL  
 BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION; ROBERT  
 MUELLER, in his official capacity as  
 Director of the Federal Bureau of  
 Investigation; ARTHUR M. CUMMINGS,  
 II, in his official capacity as Executive  
 Assistant Director of the FBI's National  
 Security Branch; NATIONAL  
 COUNTERTERRORISM CENTER;  
 MICHAEL E. LEITER, in his official  
 capacity as Director of the National

CASE NO. C06-0545 WHA

**SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT  
FOR:**

- 1) 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Violation of Equal Protection
- 2) *Bivens* – Violation of Equal Protection
- 3) 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Violation of Fourth Amendment
- 4) *Bivens* – Violation of Fourth Amendment
- 5) 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Violation of First Amendment Right to Freedom of Religion
- 6) *Bivens* – Violation of First Amendment Right to Freedom of Religion
- 7) 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Violation of First Amendment Right to Freedom of Association
- 8) *Bivens* – Violation of First Amendment Right to Freedom of Association
- 9) CA Civ. Code § 52.1 – Interference With Exercise of Civil Rights
- 10) False Imprisonment
- 11) Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress
- 12) Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress
- 13) Violation Of The United States

1 Counterterrorism Center; DEPARTMENT  
 2 OF STATE; HILARY CLINTON, in her  
 3 official capacity as Secretary of State; SAN  
 4 FRANCISCO AIRPORT; CITY AND  
 5 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; SAN  
 6 FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT;  
 7 RICHARD PATE, an individual; JOHN  
 BONDANELLA, an individual; JOHN  
 CUNNINGHAM, an individual;  
 ELIZABETH MARON, an individual; US  
 INVESTIGATIONS SERVICES, INC., a  
 Virginia Corporation; and DOES 13 through  
 100, inclusive.

8 Defendants.

9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

Constitution and the APA, Under  
 The APA And The First, Fourth,  
 Fifth And Fourteenth Amendments  
 To The United States Constitution

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

11 Plaintiff hereby alleges as follows:

**INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

12 1. The above-entitled action is brought under the United States Constitution, *Bivens*  
 v. *Six Unknown Named Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), 5  
 U.S.C. § 701 et seq., 28 U.S.C. § 2201, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the Constitution of the State of  
 California, and California state law, on the grounds that defendants, among other things, violated  
 the federal and state constitutional rights of plaintiff, granted to her under the First, Fourth, Fifth  
 and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, and article I, sections 3, 4, 7, 13  
 and 15 of the California Constitution.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

20 2. This case arises under the United States Constitution and the laws of the United  
 21 States. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Article III of the United States  
 22 Constitution, 5 U.S.C. § 552a, and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343, 1361, and 1367(a), and pursuant to  
 23 *Ibrahim v. Department of Homeland Security* (9th Cir. 2008) 538 F.3d 1250. Venue is proper in  
 24 this district, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e), because defendants include officers and employees  
 25 of the United States and the acts and conduct complained of herein occurred in this judicial  
 26 district.

## INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

3. Assignment of this action to the San Francisco Division is proper under Civil Local Rule 3-2(d), because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims alleged herein occurred in the County of San Mateo.

## PARTIES

4. Plaintiff, RAHINAH IBRAHIM, ("IBRAHIM"), is an individual, who obtained her Doctorate Degree at Stanford University, while in the United States on a student visa, and currently resides in the country of Malaysia. IBRAHIM has no criminal record and no links to terrorist activity.

5. On information and belief, defendant, ERIC H. HOLDER JR. ("HOLDER"), is the current Attorney General of the United States and the head of the United States Department of Justice. He is sued here in his official capacity. Under Homeland Presidential Security Directive-6 ("HPSD-6") and its implementing memorandum of understanding dated September 16, 2003 ("2003 MOU"), the Attorney General is responsible for establishing an organization to consolidate the United States Government's approach to terrorist screening and the use of information in the screening process, and for coordinating with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, and the Director of Central Intelligence in this effort. Pursuant to this directive, the TERRORIST SCREENING CENTER ("TSC"), was established.

6. On information and belief, defendant, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (“FBI”), is a department of the United States Government and is included in the Department of Justice. Through the TSC, the FBI maintains a government watchlist and transmits this list to the Transportation Security Administration (“TSA”). The airlines are required to check their passenger lists against the No-Fly List.

7. On information and belief, defendant, ROBERT MUELLER ("MUELLER"), is the director of the FBI, and is being sued in his official capacity as such.

8. On information and belief, defendant, TSC, is a department of the United States Government. Its mission is to maintain a list of "Terrorist Identities Information" for agencies of

1 the United States Government, including the TSA, a sub-agency of the Department of Homeland  
 2 Security (“DHS”), with authority to regulate airport security. The TSC is responsible for  
 3 maintaining a consolidated terrorist screening database (the “TSDB”) which includes the “No-  
 4 Fly List.” The TSC determines who is on the list that makes up the No-Fly list.

5 9. On information and belief, defendant, ARTHUR M. CUMMINGS, II  
 6 (“CUMMINGS”), is the Executive Assistant Director of the FBI’s National Security Branch, and  
 7 oversees the TSC. He is sued here in his official capacity.

8 10. On information and belief, defendant, LEONARD C. BOYLE (“BOYLE”) is the  
 9 Director of the TSC. He is sued here in his official capacity. The Director of the TSC is  
 10 responsible for establishing procedures to address repeated misidentification of any person, and  
 11 review the list and delete or correct any erroneous or outdated information.

12 11. On information and belief, defendant, DONNA A. BUCELLA (“BUCELLA”), is  
 13 the former Director of the TSC. She is sued here in her official capacity.

14 12. On information and belief, defendant, DHS, is a department of the United States  
 15 Government, created on October 8, 2001, to develop and coordinate the implementation of a  
 16 comprehensive national strategy to secure the United States from terrorist threats or attacks.  
 17 Under HPSD-6 and the 2003 MOU, the DHS is responsible for staffing the TSC, along with the  
 18 DEPARTMENT OF STATE (“DOS”), Department of Justice, and other federal departments and  
 19 agencies.

20 13. On information and belief, defendant, JANET NAPOLITANO  
 21 (“NAPOLITANO”), is the current Secretary and head of the Department of Homeland Security.  
 22 She is sued here in her official capacity. Under HPSD-6 and the 2003 MOU, the Secretary of the  
 23 DHS is responsible for, *inter alia*, (a) coordinating with the Attorney General, acting through the  
 24 Director of the FBI, to establish the TSC, (b) coordinating with the Attorney General, acting  
 25 through the Director of the TSC, to review alien nominations to the TSC’s database; (c) in  
 26 consultation with the other parties to the 2003 MOU and the Director of the TSC, establishing  
 27 necessary guidelines and criteria to, *inter alia*, “initiate appropriate law enforcement or other  
 28 governmental action, if any, when a person submitted for query by a private sector entity is

1 identified as a person in the terrorist screening database"; (d) reviewing each nomination to the  
 2 TSC's database and determining whether to include that person in records that can be accessed  
 3 by State, local, territorial, and trial officials for homeland security purposes.

4       14. On information and belief, defendant, MICHAEL CHERTOFF ("CHERTOFF"),  
 5 is a former Secretary and head of the Department of Homeland Security. He is sued here in his  
 6 official capacity.

7       15. On information and belief, defendant, TOM RIDGE ("RIDGE"), is a former  
 8 Secretary and head of the Department of Homeland Security. He is sued here in his official  
 9 capacity.

10       16. On information and belief, defendant, NATIONAL COUNTERTERRORISM  
 11 CENTER ("NCTC") serves as the primary organization in the United States government for  
 12 analyzing and integrating all intelligence regarding terrorism, and provides information to the  
 13 TSC.

14       17. On information and belief, defendant, MICHAEL E. LEITER ("LEITER"), is the  
 15 Director of the NCTC. He is sued here in his official capacity.

16       18. On information and belief, defendant, DOS, is a department of the United States  
 17 Government. Under HPSC-6 and the 2003 MOU, the DOS is responsible for staffing the TSC,  
 18 along with the DHS, Department of Justice, and other federal departments and agencies.

19       19. On information and belief, defendant, HILARY CLINTON ("CLINTON") is the  
 20 current Secretary and head of the DOS. She is sued here in her official capacity. Under HPSC-6  
 21 and the 2003 MOU, the Secretary of the DOS is responsible for, *inter alia*, (a) coordinating with  
 22 the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the FBI, to establish the TSC, and (b)  
 23 reviewing each nomination to the TSC's database and determining whether to include the person  
 24 in records that may be accessed by foreign governments cooperating with the United States to  
 25 fight global terrorism.

26       20. On information and belief, defendant, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
 27 FRANCISCO ("CCSF") is a municipal entity, which also oversees the SAN FRANCISCO  
 28 POLICE DEPARTMENT. On information and belief, San Francisco International Airport

1 ("SFO"), is a part of the CCSF.

2 21. On information and belief, defendant, SAN FRANCISCO POLICE  
 3 DEPARTMENT ("SFPD"), is a police department which has jurisdiction over events occurring  
 4 at SFO.

5 22. On information and belief, defendant, RICHARD PATE ("PATE"), is a Police  
 6 Sergeant for SFPD.

7 23. On information and belief, defendant, J. CUNNINGHAM ("CUNNINGHAM"),  
 8 badge number 236, is a police officer of the SFPD.

9 24. On information and belief, defendant, ELIZABETH MARON ("MARON"), is a  
 10 police officer of the SFPD.

11 25. On information and belief, defendant, JOHN BONDANELLA,  
 12 ("BONDANELLA"), from June, 2004, through May, 2005, was an employee of US  
 13 INVESTIGATIONS SERVICES, INC. ("USIS"), and was serving as a watch officer in the  
 14 TRANSPORTATION SECURITY OPERATIONS CENTER ("TSOC").

15 26. On information and belief, USIS is a corporation, organized and existing under  
 16 the laws of the State of Virginia, but which does business and has offices all over the United  
 17 States, including all over California. USIS provides intelligence and staffing services to various  
 18 entities, including federal agencies. USIS was the employer of defendant, BONDANELLA, and  
 19 provided BONDANELLA as a watch officer for the TSOC from June, 2004 through May, 2005.  
 20 The TSA disburses "Federal Security Directors" ("FSDs") to all of the commercial airlines in the  
 21 US, to lead and coordinate security activities at the respective airlines. The TSOC serves as the  
 22 point of contact for security related operations, incidents, or crises in aviation and all surface  
 23 modes of transportation, and provides guidance to FSD's as to how to handle security related  
 24 issues.

25 27. The true names or capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or  
 26 otherwise of defendants, DOES 13 through 100, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff, who  
 27 therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff prays leave to amend the  
 28 complaint to show the true names and capacities of defendants when the same have been

1 ascertained.

2 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

3 28. Plaintiff brings this lawsuit to challenge defendants' administration, management  
 4 and implementation of the TSC's TSDB, including the "No-Fly List", a list circulated to  
 5 commercial airlines and security personnel with directions to detain and question any passenger  
 6 whose name matches or is similar to one on the No-Fly List. Plaintiff further brings this lawsuit  
 7 to challenge the placement of her own name on any government list, including the No-Fly List.

8 29. Defendants began implementing the No-Fly List in November, 2001. Since then,  
 9 it has resulted in hundreds, if not thousands, of innocent passengers being routinely stopped,  
 10 questioned, searched, and sometimes physically arrested, as in this case. Defendants do not  
 11 inform individuals that they have been placed on any government list or why they are on the list.  
 12 Moreover, individuals whom defendants determine are not security threats continue to be  
 13 identified on any government list, including the No-Fly List. Passengers, therefore, have no  
 14 meaningful opportunity to challenge their identification.

15 30. For several years before the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the U.S.  
 16 Government issued directives identifying persons who were deemed to pose a threat to civil  
 17 aviation. In November, 2001, the TSA was formed and assumed responsibility for compiling  
 18 and administering these directives, with the assistance of the TSC. Today, defendants maintain  
 19 at least two watch lists of individuals perceived to be threats to aviation security. The "no-fly"  
 20 list contains names of people which airlines are prohibited from transporting. The "selectee" list  
 21 contains names of passengers who must go through additional security screening before boarding  
 22 an aircraft. These two lists collectively are referred to as the "No-Fly List." On information and  
 23 belief, the No-Fly List contains thousands of names, primarily names of individuals of Muslim or  
 24 Middle Eastern descent.

25 31. Until November, 2002, defendants denied the existence of the No-Fly List. Until  
 26 today, defendants have refused to disclose important information regarding the No-Fly List,  
 27 including the criteria for placing names on or removing names from the No-Fly List, procedures  
 28 for amending information on the List such as when it is determined that an individual is not a

1 security threat, or rules for maintaining or managing the List. Because defendants have refused  
 2 to provide any of this information, defendants may be using race, religion, ethnicity, national  
 3 origin, or the exercise of protected First Amendment rights as factors in maintenance and  
 4 implementation of the No-Fly List.

5 32. On information and belief, after the TSC became operational in 2003, it became  
 6 responsible for maintaining and updating a consolidated terrorist screening database, including  
 7 the No-Fly List, based on information received from the predecessor organization of the NCTC  
 8 (the Terrorist Threat Integration Center), the FBI, and other federal agencies. Pursuant to the  
 9 2003 MOU, the TSC was to ensure that available information possessed by state, local,  
 10 territorial, and tribal governments was considered in determinations by the TSC.

11 33. On information and belief, defendants make available continually updated  
 12 versions of the No-Fly List to commercial airlines in the United States. The 15 domestic airlines  
 13 have almost half a million employees and, on information and belief, a substantial percentage of  
 14 these employees have access to the No-Fly List. On information and belief, the No-Fly List is  
 15 also provided to customs and immigration agents, airport security, and law enforcement  
 16 agencies. Moreover, information from the No-Fly List is inputted into other security databases,  
 17 including those maintained by the NCTC, the FBI, the DOS, the DHS, the TSA, or other federal  
 18 agencies. On information and belief, defendants and the heads of their departments instruct  
 19 recipients of the No-Fly List to not allow on a flight those whose name is similar or identical to a  
 20 name on the No-Fly List. Even if the passenger's actual identity is verified, a boarding pass is  
 21 issued which is stamped with a mark to indicate the passenger must be subjected to enhanced  
 22 screening, also referred to as "secondary screening."

23 34. Innocent passengers subjected to this treatment are stigmatized, humiliated, and  
 24 subjected to interrogations, delays, enhanced searches, detentions, travel impediments, and  
 25 sometimes actual physical arrest without a warrant or any probable cause. This treatment is  
 26 completely unexpected as they have no notice that they have been placed on the No-Fly List.

27 35. Plaintiff, IBRAHIM, was subjected to this humiliating treatment on January 2,  
 28 2005, at the SFO, while traveling to Malaysia, through an initial stop in Hawaii.

1       36.    IBRAHIM is a citizen of Malaysia. She is a Muslim woman who is clearly  
 2 identifiable as Muslim as she wears a head scarf, also known as a "hijab." IBRAHIM has no  
 3 criminal record and no ties whatsoever to any terrorist activity. At the time of the incident,  
 4 IBRAHIM was a student at Stanford University, studying to obtain her Doctorate Degree (PhD),  
 5 and lawfully in the United States on a student visa. IBRAHIM's student visa was valid from  
 6 September 26, 2001 to January 11, 2007. She was preparing her thesis on affordable housing  
 7 and on January 2, 2005, IBRAHIM was scheduled to fly to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, with a  
 8 changing flight in Hawaii, to present her research findings at a conference sponsored by Stanford  
 9 University. She was scheduled to return to Stanford in March, 2005, to submit her dissertation  
 10 and complete her PhD.

11       37.    Prior to her trip, in October, 2004, IBRAHIM had a hysterectomy surgery at  
 12 Stanford University Medical Hospital, with an extremely invasive abdominal approach.  
 13 IBRAHIM suffered severe complications from her surgery which extended her recovery period  
 14 for months. IBRAHIM also suffered back and abdominal pain from her surgery and was  
 15 regularly taking medication for these complications.

16       38.    On January 2, 2005, at approximately 7:00 a.m., IBRAHIM arrived at SFO with  
 17 her fourteen-year old daughter. IBRAHIM and her daughter were scheduled to leave on a United  
 18 Airlines flight from SFO, at 9:00 a.m. IBRAHIM and her daughter, escorted by IBRAHIM's  
 19 friend, went to the ticket counter to obtain their boarding passes and check in their bags.  
 20 IBRAHIM informed United Airlines of her medical complications and requested wheelchair  
 21 transportation to the airline gate.

22       39.    At that time, a United Airlines employee, David Nevins, approached IBRAHIM  
 23 and asked to see her tickets. Nevins called SFPD and informed them that IBRAHIM was on the  
 24 No-Fly List. At the request of Nevins, defendants, CUNNINGHAM and PATE, of SFPD,  
 25 arrived at the airport. On information and belief, PATE checked the No-Fly List for  
 26 IBRAHIM's name. He called defendant, BONDANELLA, of the TSIS in Washington, D.C.  
 27 Defendant, BONDANELLA, told defendant, PATE, to not allow IBRAHIM on the flight, to  
 28 contact the FBI, and to detain IBRAHIM for questioning. A SFPD officer, whose name is not

1 known to plaintiff, also arrived at the scene.

2 40. Meanwhile, IBRAHIM stood waiting for an hour and a half, with no wheelchair,  
 3 while she suffered from back and abdominal pain. IBRAHIM's friend informed the SFPD  
 4 officers several times of IBRAHIM's medical condition.

5 41. At 8:45 a.m., fifteen minutes before IBRAHIM's flight was scheduled to leave,  
 6 defendant, CUNNINGHAM, told IBRAHIM that she was being arrested. IBRAHIM was  
 7 handcuffed by CUNNINGHAM, with her hands placed behind her back, in the middle of the  
 8 airport, in front of her fourteen-year old daughter, and everyone else at SFO. IBRAHIM was not  
 9 informed as to why she was being arrested. Instead, she was taken to the SFPD police station,  
 10 escorted by three male officers.

11 42. Upon arriving at the police station, IBRAHIM was searched by defendant,  
 12 MARON. During this search, MARON attempted to remove IBRAHIM's hijab and searched  
 13 under her hijab in public view, before the other male officers. On information and belief, the  
 14 police officers also informed the FBI of IBRAHIM's detention.

15 43. IBRAHIM was placed in a holding cell at the SFPD police station for  
 16 approximately two hours while she continued to suffer from severe back and abdominal pain.  
 17 IBRAHIM was not given her medication when she asked for it to relieve her pain. Eventually,  
 18 the paramedics were called as a result of IBRAHIM's medical condition. IBRAHIM was finally  
 19 given her medication after the paramedics left.

20 44. On information and belief, the FBI finally requested SFPD to release IBRAHIM  
 21 at approximately 11:15 a.m., over two hours after her flight had left. IBRAHIM was given no  
 22 information as to why her name was on the No-Fly List.

23 45. Defendants represented to plaintiff that her name had been removed from  
 24 the No-Fly List. The following day, on January 3, 2005, IBRAHIM discovered that she was still  
 25 on the No-Fly List when she attempted to fly again. After some effort, IBRAHIM was finally  
 26 allowed to fly to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. At SFO, however, and at every stop over, IBRAHIM  
 27 was publicly subjected to enhanced searches before boarding any flights.

28 46. On March 24, 2005, plaintiff submitted a request for Passenger Identity

1 Verification to the TSA, the only procedure then available, in an attempt to clear her name if the  
 2 issue was simply a matter of misidentification. A response was not issued to IBRAHIM's  
 3 request until approximately one year later, in March, 2006, after this action was filed. The  
 4 response, however, did not even clarify IBRAHIM'S "No-Fly List" status and instead, simply  
 5 stated that if "it has been determined that a correction to records is warranted, these records have  
 6 been modified."

7 47. Moreover, on April 14, 2005, IBRAHIM's visa was revoked by letter from the  
 8 United States Embassy in Malaysia. The letter cites to Section 212(a)(3)(B) of the Immigration  
 9 and Nationality Act as the basis for the revocation of her visa. That section provides, in part, that  
 10 any "alien" who "a consular officer, the Attorney General, or the Secretary of Homeland  
 11 Security knows, or has reasonable ground to believe, is engaged in or is likely to engage after  
 12 entry in any terrorist activity" is "inadmissible." 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(3)(b).

13 48. IBRAHIM is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants do not  
 14 remove individuals from the No-Fly List and other related watch lists, even when it would be  
 15 appropriate to do so because, among other reasons, the individual has been misidentified or  
 16 incorrectly placed on the list.

17 49. IBRAHIM is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants do not  
 18 train their employees to determine when modification or removal of information on the No-Fly  
 19 List is necessary, and have not implemented policies to ensure that modification or removal of  
 20 names occurs when appropriate.

21 50. On July 1, 2005, plaintiff filed a claim with the City and County of San Francisco  
 22 for her damages suffered as a result of defendants' conduct. On September 8, 2005, the City and  
 23 County of San Francisco issued a letter, also rejecting plaintiff's claim.

24 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

25 **(42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Equal Protection – Against Defendants SFO,  
 26 CCSF, SFPD, PATE, CUNNINGHAM, and MARON)**

27 51. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 50 above and incorporates them herein  
 28 by reference.

52. In doing the acts complained of herein, defendants deprived plaintiff of her right to Equal Protection under the United States Constitution as set forth under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution;

53. IBRAHIM's name was placed on the No-Fly List. Moreover, defendants arrested IBRAHIM for several hours, although they lacked a warrant, probable cause, or any reasonable belief that she had committed a crime. IBRAHIM is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants made the arrest despite these obvious deficiencies, because they perceived she was Muslim and a citizen of Malaysia. On information and belief, defendants acted in a discriminatory manner, with the intent to discriminate on the basis of IBRAHIM's religious beliefs and her national origin as a citizen of Malaysia.

54. Defendants, in committing the acts herein alleged, were acting under color of state law.

55. Defendants were acting in accordance with a custom, policy and/or practice of the SFO, the SFPD, and CCSF in violating plaintiff's constitutional rights as set forth above.

56. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' wrongful acts alleged herein, plaintiff suffered severe damages, including humiliation and damage to her reputation, physical pain, emotional distress, and deprivation of her constitutional rights, according to proof at the time of trial.

57. Defendants committed the actions alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, oppressively and with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff. Defendants acted with an improper motive amounting to malice and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights. As such, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from defendants in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Bivens – Equal Protection – Against Defendant BONDANELLA)**

58. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 57 above and incorporates them herein by reference.

59. In doing the acts complained of herein, defendant BONDANELLA deprived

plaintiff of her right to Equal Protection under the United States Constitution as set forth under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution;

60. BONDANELLA directed the SFPD to arrest IBRAHIM although he knew they lacked a warrant, probable cause, or any reasonable belief that she had committed a crime. IBRAHIM is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that BONDANELLA gave this direction despite these obvious deficiencies, because he believed she was Muslim and a citizen of Malaysia. On information and belief, BONDANELLA acted in a discriminatory manner, with the intent to discriminate on the basis of IBRAHIM's religious beliefs and her national origin as a citizen of Malaysia.

61. In committing the acts herein alleged, BONDANELLA was acting under color of federal law.

62. As a direct and proximate result of BONDANELLA's wrongful acts alleged herein, plaintiff suffered severe damages, including humiliation and damage to her reputation, physical pain, emotional distress, and deprivation of her constitutional rights, according to proof at the time of trial.

63. BONDANELLA committed the actions alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, oppressively and with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff. BONDANELLA acted with an improper motive amounting to malice and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights. As such, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from BONDANELLA in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

### **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Fourth Amendment – Against Defendants SFO, CCSF, SFPD, PATE, CUNNINGHAM, and MARON)**

64. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 63 above and incorporates them herein by reference.

65. In doing the acts complained of herein, defendants deprived plaintiff of her right against unreasonable searches and seizures under the United States Constitution as set forth under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution;

66. IBRAHIM's name was placed on the No-Fly List. Moreover, defendants arrested IBRAHIM for several hours and searched her, although they lacked a warrant, probable cause, or any reasonable belief that she had committed a crime.

67. In committing the acts herein alleged, defendants were acting under color of state law.

68. Defendants were acting in accordance with a custom, policy and/or practice of the SFO, the SFPD, and CCSF in violating plaintiff's constitutional rights as set forth above. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants' actions alleged herein were the direct and proximate result of the San Francisco Airport's, CCSF's and the SFPD's failure adequately to train SFPD officers on what is required under the Fourth Amendment and the case law interpreting it to arrest a suspect lawfully, and specifically on whether an arrest may be made on the basis of an alleged placement on a government watch list. Such failure amounts to deliberate indifference to the rights of persons with whom the SFPD comes into contact.

69. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' wrongful acts alleged herein, plaintiff suffered severe damages, including humiliation and damage to her reputation, physical pain, emotional distress, and deprivation of her constitutional rights, according to proof at the time of trial.

70. Defendants committed the actions alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, oppressively and with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff. Defendants acted with an improper motive amounting to malice and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights. As such, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from defendants in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

## **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Bivens – Fourth Amendment – Against Defendant BONDANELLA)**

71. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 70 above and incorporates them herein by reference.

72. In doing the acts complained of herein, BONDANELLA deprived plaintiff of her right against unreasonable searches and seizures under the United States Constitution as set forth

1 under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution;

2 73. BONDANELLA directed defendants to arrest IBRAHIM, although he knew they  
 3 lacked a warrant, probable cause, or any reasonable belief that IBRAHIM had committed a  
 4 crime. BONDANELLA's direction proximately caused plaintiff's arrest.

5 74. In committing the acts herein alleged, BONDANELLA was acting under color of  
 6 federal law.

7 75. As a direct and proximate result of BONDANELLA's wrongful acts alleged  
 8 herein, plaintiff suffered severe damages, including humiliation and damage to her reputation,  
 9 physical pain, emotional distress, and deprivation of her constitutional rights, according to proof  
 10 at the time of trial.

11 76. BONDANELLA committed the actions alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently,  
 12 oppressively and with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff. BONDANELLA acted with  
 13 an improper motive amounting to malice and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights. As  
 14 such, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from BONDANELLA in an amount  
 15 according to proof at the time of trial.

16 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

17 **(42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Freedom of Religion – Against Defendants SFO,  
 18 CCSF, SFPD, PATE, CUNNINGHAM, and MARON)**

19 77. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 76 above and incorporates them herein  
 20 by reference.

21 78. In doing the acts complained of herein, defendants deprived plaintiff of her  
 22 freedom of religion under the United States Constitution as set forth under the First Amendment  
 23 to the United States Constitution;

24 79. Plaintiff's name was placed on the No-Fly List. Plaintiff is an identifiable  
 25 Muslim woman who wears the hijab. Moreover, defendants arrested IBRAHIM for several  
 26 hours, although they lacked a warrant, probable cause, or any reasonable belief that she had  
 27 committed a crime. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants  
 28 arrested her because of her protected religious expression and because they perceived she was

1 Muslim

2 80. Defendants, in committing the acts herein alleged, were acting under color of state  
3 law.

4 81. Defendants were acting in accordance with a custom, policy and/or practice of the  
5 SFO, the SFPD, and CCSF in violating plaintiff's constitutional rights as set forth above.

6 82. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' wrongful acts alleged herein,  
7 plaintiff suffered severe damages, including humiliation and damage to her reputation, physical  
8 pain, emotional distress, and deprivation of her constitutional rights, according to proof at the  
9 time of trial.

10 83. Defendants committed the actions alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently,  
11 oppressively and with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff. Defendants acted with an  
12 improper motive amounting to malice and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights. As  
13 such, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from defendants in an amount according to  
14 proof at the time of trial.

#### SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

##### **(*Bivens – First Amendment Freedom of Religion – Against Defendant BONDANELLA*)**

17 84. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 83 above and incorporates them herein  
18 by reference.

19 85. In doing the acts complained of herein, BONDANELLA deprived plaintiff of her  
20 freedom of religion under the United States Constitution as set forth under the First Amendment  
21 to the United States Constitution;

22 86. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that BONDANELLA  
23 directed defendants to arrest her because he believed she was Muslim.

24 87. In committing the acts herein alleged, BONDANELLA was acting under color of  
25 federal law.

26 88. As a direct and proximate result of BONDANELLA's wrongful acts alleged  
27 herein, plaintiff suffered severe damages, including humiliation and damage to her reputation,  
28 physical pain, emotional distress, and deprivation of her constitutional rights, according to proof

1 at the time of trial.

2 89. BONDANELLA committed the actions alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently,  
 3 oppressively and with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff. BONDANELLA acted with  
 4 an improper motive amounting to malice and with conscious disregard for plaintiff's rights. As  
 5 such, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from BONDANELLA in an amount  
 6 according to proof at the time of trial.

7 **SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

8 **(42 U.S.C. § 1983 – First Amendment Right to Freedom of Association – Against  
 9 Defendants SFO, CCSF, SFPD, PATE, CUNNINGHAM, and MARON)**

10 90. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 89 above and incorporates them herein  
 11 by reference.

12 91. In doing the acts complained of herein, defendants deprived plaintiff of her  
 13 freedom of association under the United States Constitution, which is protected under the First  
 14 Amendment to the United States Constitution;

15 92. Plaintiff's name was placed on the No-Fly List. Plaintiff is an identifiable  
 16 Muslim woman who wears the hijab. Moreover, defendants arrested IBRAHIM for several  
 17 hours, although they lacked a warrant, probable cause, or any reasonable belief that she had  
 18 committed a crime. Defendants violated plaintiff's freedom of association in that, on  
 19 information and belief, defendants arrested plaintiff based on her association with the Muslim  
 20 community or the Islamic religion, and based on her national origin.

21 93. Defendants, in committing the acts herein alleged, were acting under color of state  
 22 law.

23 94. Defendants were acting in accordance with a custom, policy and/or practice of the  
 24 SFO, the SFPD, and CCSF in violating plaintiff's constitutional rights as set forth above.

25 95. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' wrongful acts alleged herein,  
 26 plaintiff suffered severe damages, including humiliation and damage to her reputation, physical  
 27 pain, emotional distress, and deprivation of her constitutional rights, according to proof at the  
 28 time of trial.

96. Defendants committed the actions alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, oppressively and with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff. Defendants acted with an improper motive amounting to malice and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights. As such, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from defendants in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

**EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Bivens – First Amendment Freedom of Association – Against Defendant BONDANELLA)**

97. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 96 above and incorporates them herein by reference.

98. In doing the acts complained of herein, BONDANELLA deprived plaintiff of her freedom of association under the United States Constitution as set forth under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution;

99. BONDANELLA violated plaintiff's freedom of association in that, on information and belief, he directed defendants to arrest plaintiff based on her association with the Muslim community or the Islamic religion, and based on her national origin.

100. In committing the acts herein alleged, BONDANELLA was acting under color of federal law.

101. As a direct and proximate result of BONDANELLA's wrongful acts alleged herein, plaintiff suffered severe damages, including humiliation and damage to her reputation, physical pain, emotional distress, and deprivation of her constitutional rights, according to proof at the time of trial.

102. BONDANELLA committed the actions alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, oppressively and with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff. BONDANELLA acted with an improper motive amounting to malice and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights. As such, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from BONDANELLA in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

## **NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Interference With Exercise Of Civil Rights – California Civil Code Section 52.1 –  
Against Defendants CCSF, SFPD, PATE, CUNNINGHAM, MARON,  
BONDANELLA, and USIS)**

103. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 102 above and incorporates them herein by reference.

104. Defendants' conduct alleged herein interfered with, or constituted an attempt to interfere with, plaintiffs' constitutional rights by threatening or committing violent acts, in that defendants caused plaintiff's arrest without a warrant or other legal process, without probable cause, and without any reasonable belief that plaintiff had committed a crime. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants caused her to be arrested despite these obvious deficiencies because they perceived she was Muslim or affiliated with the Muslim community, and because of her national origin.

105. The arrest interfered with plaintiff's constitutional rights granted to her under the First, Fourth, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, and article I, sections 3, 4, 7, 13 and 15 of the California Constitution, through violence or the threat of violence.

106. As a proximate result of the acts of defendants herein alleged, plaintiff incurred both economic and noneconomic damages.

107. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants committed the actions alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, oppressively and with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff. Defendants acted with an improper, evil motive amounting to malice and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights. As such, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from defendants in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

## **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(False Imprisonment – Against Defendants CCSF, SFPD, PATE, CUNNINGHAM, MARON, BONDANELLA, and USIS)**

108. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 107 above and incorporates them herein by reference.

109. On January 2, 2005, at SFO, defendants caused plaintiff's arrest, without a warrant, or other legal process, without probable cause and without any reasonable belief that plaintiff had committed a crime.

110. Plaintiff was imprisoned at the SFO police station for hours.

111. As a proximate result of the acts of defendants herein alleged, plaintiff incurred both economic and noneconomic damages.

112. Defendants committed the actions alleged herein maliciously, fraudulently, oppressively and with the wrongful intention of injuring plaintiff. Defendants acted with an improper, evil motive amounting to malice and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights. As such, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages from defendants in an amount according to proof at the time of trial.

## **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress – Against Defendants CCSF, SFPD, PATE, CUNNINGHAM, MARON, BONDANELLA, and USIS)**

113. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 112 above and incorporates them herein by reference.

114. On January 2, 2005, defendants caused plaintiff's arrest, knowing that they lacked a warrant or other legal process. Defendants caused the arrest, knowing that they lacked probable cause or any reasonable belief that plaintiff had committed a crime. Therefore, defendants caused the arrest with the intention of causing, or reckless disregard of the probability of causing, emotional distress for plaintiff.

115. On information and belief, the acts of the defendants herein alleged were willful, despicable, malicious, and oppressive.

116. As a proximate result of the acts of defendants herein alleged, plaintiff incurred severe emotional distress and mental suffering. Plaintiff experienced extreme humiliation, shame, and anger when:

a) Defendants, police officers, handcuffed plaintiff in front of her fourteen year old daughter at the San Francisco Airport, on the morning of January 2, 2005;

b) A crowd of passengers gathered to watch defendants, police officers, detain and arrest plaintiff, without a warrant or probable cause, at the San Francisco Airport on the morning of January 2, 2005;

c) Defendants, police officers, forced plaintiff to miss her flight by detaining and arresting her without a warrant or probable cause;

d) Defendant, MARON, removed part of plaintiff's hijab and loosened plaintiff's hair;

e) Defendants, police officers, caused plaintiff to experience abdominal pain and high blood pressure by incarcerating plaintiff in a detention area without access to her medications;

f) Defendants, police officers, forced plaintiff to urinate in a public area while in the holding cell.

g) Defendants represented to plaintiff that her name had been removed from the No-Fly List, but plaintiff later discovered that defendants had in fact made no effort to remove plaintiff from the No-Fly List.

**TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress – Against Defendants CCSF, SFPD, PATE, CUNNINGHAM, MARON, BONDANELLA, and USIS)**

117. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 116 above and incorporates them herein by reference.

118. On January 2, 2005, defendants knew or should have known that arresting and imprisoning plaintiff without a warrant or probable cause would cause plaintiff severe emotional distress.

119. On January 2, 2005, defendants caused plaintiff's arrest, knowing that they lacked a warrant or other legal process. Defendants caused the arrest, knowing that they lacked probable cause or any reasonable belief that plaintiff had committed a crime.

120. On information and belief, the acts of the defendants herein alleged were willful, desppicable, malicious, and oppressive.

121. As a proximate result of the acts of defendants herein alleged, plaintiff incurred severe emotional distress and mental suffering. Plaintiff experienced extreme humiliation, shame, and anger when:

a) Defendants, police officers, handcuffed plaintiff in front of her fourteen year old daughter at the San Francisco Airport, on the morning of January 2, 2005;

b) A crowd of passengers gathered to watch defendants, police officers, detain and arrest plaintiff, without a warrant or probable cause, at the San Francisco Airport on the morning of January 2, 2005;

c) Defendants, police officers, forced plaintiff to miss her flight by detaining and arresting her without a warrant or probable cause;

d) Defendant, MARON, removed part of plaintiff's hijab and loosened plaintiff's hair;

e) Defendants, police officers, caused plaintiff to experience abdominal pain and high blood pressure by incarcerating plaintiff in a detention area without access to her medications;

f) Defendants, police officers, forced plaintiff to urinate in a public area;

g) Defendants represented to plaintiff that her name had been removed from the No-Fly List, but plaintiff later discovered that defendants had in fact made no effort to remove plaintiff from the No-Fly List.

## **THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Violation Of The United States Constitution and the APA, Under The APA And The First, Fourth, Fifth And Fourteenth Amendments To The United States Constitution – Against Defendants DHS, HOLDER, FBI, MUELLER, TSC, CUMMINGS, BOYLE, BUCELLA, NAPOLITANO, CHERTOFF, RIDGE, NCTC, LEITER, DOS, and CLINTON)**

122. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 121 above and incorporates them herein by reference.

123. Defendants are responsible for implementing HPSD-6, coordinating the operations of the TSC, and/or maintaining, administering, compiling, and correcting the TSC's TSDB, including the No-Fly List. Defendants erroneously placed IBRAHIM's name on a

1 government watch list on an improper and unconstitutional basis, disseminated this fact to  
 2 various government agencies, state actors, and private individuals in error, and subsequently  
 3 failed to remove her name from the list despite her request for redress, which resulted in her  
 4 unlawful arrest and, IBRAHIM is informed and believes, the unfounded revocation of her visa.  
 5 In doing the acts complained of herein, defendants were acting within their respective official  
 6 capacities and under color of authority. In doing the acts complained of herein, defendants  
 7 deprived plaintiff of her right to procedural and substantive due process, equal protection,  
 8 freedom of religion, and freedom of association under the United States Constitution as set forth  
 9 under the First, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

10       124. The No-Fly List or any government screening list, and the placement of  
 11 IBRAHIM on such lists is unconstitutional in that it violates the due process protections  
 12 guaranteed under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution. On  
 13 information and belief, the placement of names on the No-Fly List is done in an arbitrary and  
 14 capricious manner and without any factual findings or rational basis.

15       125. Defendants' actions in administering and maintaining the No-Fly List deprived  
 16 plaintiff of liberty and property interests protected by the Fifth Amendment. Plaintiff has a right  
 17 to be free from being falsely stigmatized as an individual associated with terrorist activity,  
 18 where, as here, the stigma causes a change in legal status that affects her ability to travel and  
 19 work in academia, her chosen profession. Defendants' actions alleged herein publicly made  
 20 clear that the United States government considered IBRAHIM a security risk, a charge which  
 21 IBRAHIM denies. Defendants are grossly negligent, reckless, and/or deliberately indifferent to  
 22 the risk that the deprivations these actions cause. The deprivations are without due process of  
 23 law because plaintiff was not informed of her placement on the No-Fly List or given any  
 24 opportunity to contest such placement. Also, defendants have failed to provide constitutionally  
 25 adequate mechanisms for plaintiff to avoid being subjected to the stigma, interrogations, delays,  
 26 enhanced searches, detentions, and/or other travel impediments associated with having a name  
 27 identical or similar to a name on the No-Fly List.

28       126. Plaintiff is an identifiable Muslim woman who wears the hijab. On information

1 and belief, defendants acted in a discriminatory manner, with the intent to discriminate, in that  
 2 IBRAHIM was placed on the No-Fly List based on her religious beliefs and her national origin  
 3 as a citizen of Malaysia. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants  
 4 would not have engaged in the conduct alleged herein but for her religious affiliation and  
 5 national origin. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that defendants habitually  
 6 place Muslims and Malaysian nationals on government watchlists, or fail to remove them from  
 7 such watchlists, on the basis of religion and national origin, without conducting an individualized  
 8 investigation, and regardless of whether defendants can articulate any facts in support of such  
 9 placement or non-removal. Defendants' placement of IBRAHIM's name on the No-Fly list on  
 10 these impermissible bases, and subsequent failure to remove it, violated her First Amendment  
 11 rights of freedom of religion and freedom of association, and her Fifth and Fourteenth  
 12 Amendment right to equal protection.

13       127. Defendants' actions alleged herein were arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of  
 14 discretion, and not in accordance with the law, in violation of the APA. Defendants have failed  
 15 to adopt adequate procedures to prevent misidentification or to ensure that incorrect information  
 16 is modified or removed from the TSC's TSDB, as required by the 2003 MOU implementing  
 17 HPSD-6.

18       128. An actual and immediate controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff  
 19 and defendants related to their respective rights and duties. Defendants have acted arbitrarily  
 20 and capriciously, abused their discretion, and unlawfully failed to comply with constitutional  
 21 requirements by engaging in the acts and omissions described in this Complaint. Plaintiff is,  
 22 therefore, entitled to a declaration of rights over this controversy.

23       129. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. Defendants have acted, and continue to  
 24 act, to deprive plaintiff of her constitutional rights. Plaintiff is suffering and will continue to  
 25 suffer irreparable injury as a result of the policies and practices described in this Complaint  
 26 unless those policies and practices are enjoined by this Court. Plaintiff has no plain, adequate, or  
 27 speedy remedy at law and is entitled to injunctive relief against defendants. Plaintiff has no  
 28 administrative remedy because defendants' policies and practices preclude any administrative

1 determinations from affording actual relief.

2 **PRAYER**

3 WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray for the following relief:

- 4 a. For compensatory damages according to proof;
- 5 b. For civil penalties, to the extent provided by law;
- 6 c. For exemplary and punitive damages according to proof;
- 7 d. For costs of suit, including attorneys' fees;
- 8 e. For a declaration, order, and judgment that defendants' placement of IBRAHIM'S  
9 name on the No-Fly List and their subsequent failure to remove her name from  
10 the No-Fly List were arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion,  
11 unauthorized by law, and contrary to IBRAHIM'S rights under the First, Fifth,  
12 and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.
- 13 f. For an injunction requiring defendants to remove IBRAHIM's name from the No-  
14 Fly List database maintained by the TSC, and from any other related database  
15 maintained or accessed by other federal agencies, including but not limited to,  
16 databases maintained or accessed by the NCTC, the FBI, the DOS, the DHS, the  
17 TSA, the TSOC, USIS, or any other agency that maintains information regarding  
18 individuals whose names have been placed on the No-Fly List or other watch list  
19 due to alleged terrorist-related activities; and
- 20 g. For an injunction requiring defendants to communicate the removal of  
21 IBRAHIM'S name from the No-Fly List to the United States Visa Office, the  
22 United States Embassy in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, and any other government  
23 agency, foreign or domestic, that relies on information from the NCTC, the TSC,  
24 the FBI, the DOS, the DHS, or the TSA, to identify visa applicants who may be  
25 inadmissible pursuant to Section 212(a)(3)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality  
26 Act; or
- 27 h. Alternatively, for a declaration, order, and judgment that IBRAHIM is entitled to  
28 a name-clearing hearing regarding the placement of her name on the TSC's

1 TSDB; and

2 i. For an injunction requiring defendants to provide IBRAHIM with a name clearing  
3 hearing regarding the placement of her name on the TSC's TSDB; and  
4 j. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem appropriate.

5 Dated: March 27, 2009

6 McMANIS FAULKNER

7 *Christine E. Peek*  
8 JAMES McMANIS  
9 MARWA ELZANKALY  
CHRISTINE PEEK

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
11 RAHINAH IBRAHIM

12 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

13 Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial as provided by Rule 38(a) of the Federal Rules of  
14 Civil Procedure.

15 Dated: March 27, 2009

16 McMANIS FAULKNER

17 *Christine E. Peek*  
18 JAMES McMANIS  
19 MARWA ELZANKALY  
CHRISTINE PEEK

20 Attorneys for Plaintiff,  
21 RAHINAH IBRAHIM